

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 3-5, and 8-15 have been amended to corrected informalities therein noted by the Examiner. Claims 1-16 are pending.

The Examiner objected to many of the claims and suggested language so the claims “read more easily”. Applicant traverses this objection and has not amended the claims to read more easily, since the claims read properly as filed based on the proper use of commas. The Examiner is requesting the claims to be amended in a manner that may unnecessarily create possible estoppel issues. Objections to the claims other than those to make the claims read more easily have been addressed by the amendments presented above.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavsky et al. in view of Vange et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claims 1 and 16, the Examiner contends that Miloslavsky teaches “storing, in response to a first HTTP request” since the web developer, who generated the web page that included the call center number, “published the web page by sending it to the server using HTTP”. Publishing a web page is not a teaching of storing an XML document in response to an HTTP request as claimed.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 1, 6, 11 and 16, the Examiner contends that Miloslavsky selectively generates a second HTML document, based on a prescribed input received from the second party, having instructions for connecting the second

party with the user. In Miloslavsky, the Examiner is considering the second party to be the call center and the user as the person who is contacting the call center. In Miloslavsky, there is no second HTML document generated based on an input received from the call center or second party.

The claimed invention enables a customer (user) to speak with a customer support representative (second party) without ever having to remain on hold. For example, a customer support line can be contacted by the customer via a generated first HTML document and, if the customer support representative is serving another person, the customer support representative can communicate with the customer, via the generated second HTML document, when the second party is available.

As disclosed at column 15, lines 5-40 of Miloslavsky, once the user clicks on the button in the web page, a telephone number of an agent at the call center is reserved and then a telephone connection is established between the agent and the user. The agent's browser can display the same HTML document sent to the user, e.g., the agent can see the same web page that the user sees (see column 13, lines 7-15 of Miloslavsky). Thus, no second HTML page having instructions for connecting the second party with the user is generated based on an input of the call center. Also, with regard to the embodiment of Miloslavsky wherein the user requests the call center to call the user, there is no input of the call center upon which a second HTML document is based. The software module SRP 1168 requests the call center to call the user's telephone number (see Miloslavsky column 15, lines 40-59). No HTML document is employed.

The Examiner contends that an agent placing a call on hold is a prescribed input as claimed. Placing a call on hold by the agent is simply not an input, upon which the generation of a second HTML page having instructions for connecting the second party

with the user, is based. As noted above, with the claimed invention, there is no need for a user (customer) to be on hold. Vange does not supply the deficiencies of Miloslavsky. Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

With regard to claims 2 and 7, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 6, respectively, and are considered to be allowable for the reasons advanced above and for the additional reason that the added subject matter thereof is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

With regard to claims 12 and 13, these claims have been amended to positively recite the claim features and are considered to be allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavsky in view of Vange and further in view of Casellini. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest a first HTML having instructions for recording a voice message indicating to the second party that the user wants to speak with the second party.

The indication of allowable claims is noted with thanks. However, the allowable dependent claims have not been rewritten in independent format since the base claims are considered to be allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons above.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, It is submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Parasu – Application No. 09/577,320
Response filed: March 7, 2005

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-426, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Stemberger', written in a cursive style.

Edward J. Stemberger
Registration No. 36,017
Phone: 202.261.1014

Customer No. 23164